

## **REMARKS**

Initially, Applicant notes that the remarks and amendments made in this response are consistent with those presented to the Examiner by telephone.

By this paper, claims 1, 18, 23, 28, 37-38, and 40 have been amended, claims 2, 24, 32, have been canceled, while no claims have been added, such that claims 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-38 and 40 remain pending, of which claims 1, 28, 37, and 40 are the only independent claims at issue.

The Office Action, mailed August 20, 2008, considered and rejected claims 1-38 and 40. Claim 37 was objected to because of a grammatical informality. Claims 1-23, 27-28, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Thebaut et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,953). Claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thebaut and Kuznetsov et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2006/0265689).<sup>1</sup>

The claimed embodiments are directed to the deterministic dispatch of a Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) envelope to software methods when multiple, potentially conflicting rules governing the dispatch are present. For example, claim 1 recites a method for a computing system to perform deterministic rule-based dispatch of the (SOAP) envelope to a group of one or more software methods for further processing. In the method, the computing system first accesses a (SOAP) envelope that is to be dispatched to one or more software methods for processing. Then, the computing system evaluates a list of rules to identify a plurality of rules that apply to the dispatch of the (SOAP) envelope, with each of the plurality of rules specifying a condition and a group of one or more software methods the (SOAP) envelope should be dispatched to if the condition is met. After evaluating the list of rules, the computing system resolves the plurality of rules utilizing one or more prioritizing mechanisms, with at least one prioritizing mechanism being configured guarantee only a single rule will prevail in the case of conflicting rules. A single prevailing rule is identified that will be applied for the dispatch of the (SOAP) envelope, wherein only the single prevailing rule will be applied for the dispatch of the (SOAP) envelope to the group of one or more software methods. The computing system then dispatches the (SOAP) envelope to the group of one or more software methods specified by the single prevailing rule.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Independent claims 28 and 40 contain similar elements and are related to claim 1. Claim 28 recites a computer program product that implements the method of claim 1, claim 37 recites a method similar to claim 1, but using functional step for language, and claim 40 recites a computer system that implements the method of claim 1.

The claims were rejected in view of a single reference, Thebaut. Thebaut is directed to embodiments for determining an enforceable policy applicable to one or more network devices, including resolving conflicts to produce enforceable policies. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach or reasonably support all of the elements presented in the amended claims. For example, the cited art fails to teach, suggest, or reasonably support the computing system evaluating the list of rules to identify a plurality of rules that apply to the SOAP envelope, and/or the computing system resolving the list of rules to identify a single prevailing rule. Furthermore, the cited art of Thebaut fails to disclose embodiments utilizing SOAP envelopes. In view of the failure of the cited art to teach at least these claim elements, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to render the claims unpatentable.

While the cited art discusses managing rule conflicts, such management of conflicts is performed at the domain level and prior to ever receiving a SOAP envelope. Nowhere within Thebaut, is there a discussion of identifying rules or resolving rules to a single rule at the time the SOAP envelope is received, as is recited in the pending claims. The prevailing reason Thebaut fails to discuss such an element is that conflicting rules do not exist within Thebaut at the time a SOAP envelope would be received. Instead, conflicting rules are identified at the time the rules are received as described in columns 5 and 6 of Thebaut. This contrasts with the presently claimed embodiments, wherein conflicts can exist among rules for a particular SOAP envelope, yet the embodiments still allows a single deterministic rule to prevail. In short, Thebaut resolves conflicts among rules at the time the policy framework is established and the rules are defined, while the presently claimed embodiments determine a rule at the time the SOAP envelope is received.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any

of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 17<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Colby C. Nuttall, Reg. # 58146/

RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
COLBY C. NUTTALL  
Registration No. 58,146  
JOHN C. BACOCK  
Registration No. 59,890  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCB:CCN:gd